REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified

application. Claims 9, 18 and 27 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of September 1, 2009, claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 19 are amended and claims 8, 17 and 26 are cancelled.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Angles et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,811) ("Angles") in view of Prust (U.S. Pat.

No. 6,735,623) ("Prust") in further view of Cunningham et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,353,267)

("Cunningham"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claims 1, 10 and 19 recite a content management system

where a content managing portion determines the date and time when each content is clicked and

creates a database containing the determined date and time.

This is clearly unlike Angles, Prust or Cunningham which fail to disclose or even fairly

suggest anything pertaining to a content management system where a content managing portion

determines the date and time when each content is clicked and creates a database containing the

determined values. Instead, Angles discloses collecting user demographic data such as age, sex,

income, career, hobbies, etc and not counting the date and time which a link is clicked. See, U.S.

Pat. No. 5,933,811, Col. 14, l. 16-26. Prust merely discloses allowing a user access to a content

library once the user provides demographic data without counting anything pertaining the clicked

date and time of a link. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,735,623, Col. 6, l. 13-19. Cunningham discloses

- 7 -

displaying a predetermined number of advertisements based on the amount of time a user is

online. U.S. Pat. No. 7,353,267, Col. 18, 1. 6-21.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a content management system

where a content managing portion determines the date and time when each content is clicked and

creates a database containing the determined date and time, advertisers can determine which

advertisements are most effective. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0073190, Para. [0060]-[0061].

Therefore, because Angles, Prust, Cunningham or any combination of them fails to

disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claims 1, 10 and 19, the rejection of claims 1, 10

and 19 cannot stand. Because claims 2-7, 11-16 and 20-25 depend, either directly or indirectly,

from claims 1, 10 and 19, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

-8-

Response to September 1, 2009 Final Office Action Application No. 09/897,237

Page 9

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 19, 2009 By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000